



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

died in 1799. The first treaty of Paris was not signed on April 30, 1814, but on May 30 (III. 225). The electoral law of February 5, 1817, did not remain in force "for thirty years" (III. 257) but for only three years. Moreover in the very next paragraph the author refers, for our mystification, to "the electoral law of 5 September, 1817". The statement that Odilon Barrot was the leader of the Republican party in France about 1840 is amazing (III. 291) and is in contradiction with the statement three pages later (III. 294) that he was the leader of the Dynastic Left. The plébiscite of 1851 was held on December 20, not on December 30 (III. 318). Most emphatically Lesseps was not sent to Rome in 1849 "to arrange terms of peace at any price" (III. 313).

Speaking of Lamartine, whom he has previously characterized as a "great political hypnotist" and as having had an "ascendancy over all" parties under Louis Philippe, which is certainly news, the author states, "It is this dominance of Lamartine that makes the whole period of the Second Republic such a strange episode in government; almost laughable in its blunders, capricious contradictions, and inconsequences" (III. 300). It would be difficult to compress more misconceptions into a single phrase. After this it is perhaps unnecessary to point out that Bismarck was not at the Congress of Paris in 1856 (III. 327); that the Polish insurrection occurred in 1863, not 1862, as apparently stated on page 338 (vol. III.); that Bismarck did not hurry "ostentatiously to the side of Russia" and that his "unsolicited overtures" did not end in "an agreement between the two Powers for joint action (February 8, 1862)", one reason at least being that he did not enter the Prussian ministry until September, 1862 (III. 339).

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

*An Economic History of Russia.* By JAMES MAVOR, Ph.D., Professor of Political Economy, University of Toronto. In two volumes. (London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1914. Pp. xxxii, 614; xxi, 630.)

THE Anglo-Saxon world should welcome a pioneer work whose object is "to present to English readers the main result of recent historical researches which have been conducted by various Russian scholars". Professor Mavor has very conveniently divided his two massive volumes into seven books of about equal length and has covered the economic history of Russia from its beginning to 1907.

In certain external aspects of the book, the author may be unfavorably criticized. No uniform system of transliteration has been used throughout the work. Moreover, the author does not spell correctly in his transliterations, as when he transliterates the letter III by "tsch" in English (I. 40 ff.). It must be either "shch" or "shtch" or something similar. Frequent grammatical errors, such as the use of the

genitive plural "yamskikh" (I. 132) for the nominative singular, have crept in. *Teurks* is used for Turks, *Khersonessus* of *Tauridas* for *Tauric Chersonese*, *Loparian* for *Lap*, etc. (I. 576 ff). On the other hand, it may be said without hesitation that the author uses the Russian language ably for purposes of research. The work is not founded largely on documentary, but, with a few exceptions, on secondary material which indeed is often the best that exists. There is occasionally some confusion as to the old and new style in chronology.

In tracing the economic history of Russia to 1762 in the First Book, the author follows closely the famous work of the late *Kliuchevski*, Russia's best synthetic historian. Previously, a clear outline of the economic history of that period did not exist, even though it may be found imbedded with much other material in the work just mentioned. In describing Slavic origins with so much detail, Professor *Mavor* might have used the works of *Niederle*, *Florinski*, *Peisker*, and *Hrushevski*, not to mention others. In this he is less an anthropologist than an historian, and more an economist than anything. The account of *Kievan Russia* is excellent, and the great changes brought about by the Mongol conquest are on the whole adequately treated. The rise of bondage is admirably traced, and the field is cleared of the false scholarship which claimed that serfdom began with the ukase of 1597. The economic achievements of *Peter the Great*, as well as his place in history, are exalted above the views current among Russian and Western scholars alike, and for the first time, the author shows his independence, even in the face of such excellent authority as that of *Miliukov*.

The Second Book is devoted to the fall of bondage right and to an analysis of agriculture under bondage. Here a minute examination of great value is made of all kinds of agricultural peasants in the eighteenth century. This is based largely on the researches of *Semevski*, whose works have superseded those of *Bielaiev*. The chapter (IX.) on the literary movement so far as it affected the peasant question would bear expansion, because of the important part literature played in Russian history. Disappointing likewise is the chapter on the Slavophiles and the *mir*. The examination of the *mir* does not go back far enough historically, and it strangely fails to give the present state of Russian research on this thorny question. The chapter (XIII.) on the editing commission is an able one. Especially illuminating here is the author's description of the line-up of liberal and reactionary forces, of the martyrdom of the liberal *Rostovtsev*, who died of overwork, and of the reactionary opacity of his successor, *Panin*.

The Third Book covers the subjects of the fall of bondage and industry under bondage. On the whole, this is one of the most interesting parts of the work, even though serfdom and not industry occupies the centre of the stage. The author has depended here almost wholly on the excellent works of *Semevski* and *Tugan-Baranovski*, the standard authorities in the field. Now and then the results of pamphlet litera-

ture are thrown on the screen, making the whole a valuable piece of work. Most illuminating is the struggle of the Kustarnaia Izba or Home Work against the factory system, the final supremacy of the latter, and the transformation of the former into an "artistic and philanthropic" industry. The final chapter, which sums up the gradual triumph of protection, is a useful bit of synthesis and shows the author at his best.

In the Fourth Book, the modern political and social revolutionary movement in Russia prior to 1903 is discussed. The story of Pugachev's revolt, 1773-1775, is told in a most pleasing narrative based almost wholly on Dubrovin's exhaustive work. The revolt of the Dekabristi, 1824-1825, which is called "the first modern revolutionary movement in Russia", is inadequately treated. The introduction to the part played by socialism in the revolutionary movement is undoubtedly valuable in itself, but much of it could have been condensed, because the V Narod (To be of the People) movement was "characteristically Russian" and steeped in the philosophy of Bakunin. In the chapters on the V Narod movement and on the more actively revolutionary Narodnaia Volia (The People's Will), which dashed itself to pieces against the police bureaucracy by 1887, the author actually weaves together a new account of this period. Important also is the description of the gradual emergence of Marxism, as evidenced by the growth of the Social Democratic movement begun in 1885. The existence of a revived and radical revolutionary state of mind just before the Russo-Japanese War is ably traced. The same, however, cannot be said of the treatment of the Far East, which is founded on meagre sources and which constitutes by far the weakest part of the whole work. The treaty of Aigun (1858) is passed over too lightly, while to state that the Franco-Russian Entente (?) had melted away in 1898 and 1904 (II. 236, 240) is too strong.

The Fifth Book is devoted to the complicated agrarian question. The observations on peasant character and classes, the primitive family, the *pomieshchik* or landlord, and the condition of agriculture since 1861 are valuable to the Western reader. Perhaps most interesting is the analysis of the peasantry in 1905, in which the author reaches the conclusion that just before the revolution the peasant became inoculated with a revived Bakuninism in which the cry was for the nationalization of the land and the destruction of the state. Illuminating also is the author's conclusion that the Russian peasant revolted because he wished to hasten the improvement of his condition and not because his condition was desperate.

The Sixth Book, devoted to the industrial development of Russia under capitalism, shows how gradually the artisan came to blame the government for his woes. In contrast to the peasant, the artisan wished the state organization of industry and hence a powerful state. The brief chapters on wages, housing, and factory legislation are suggestive,

if not conclusive, while that on the labor movement and another on the employers' association help to round out a very difficult subject. This part of the field is hardly ready for scientific historical work.

The Seventh and last Book deals with the revolutionary movement in Russia, 1903-1907. It is to be regretted that it does not weave together the loosely connected narrative of the preceding six books and point out more clearly the antithesis which existed between the peasant and the artisan. An important portion of the book is given over to the part played by Father Gapon in the revolution. Though personally weak, he succeeded in creating the "first real legal trade union" which destroyed the faith of the common people in the Czar and thus removed the last obstacle to the grasp of violent hands at the inalienable rights of man. The story of the general strikes, of the Black Hundred Pogroms, and of the Counter-Revolution is interesting. It is to be regretted, however, that the author did not continue his study beyond 1907, because it might have been written from as trustworthy material as any used for the account of the last decade.

Although the secondary material used by Professor Mavor is of a very high character, one often finds that he has neglected works of capital importance. He does not appear to have used Chernevski's bibliography, nor Ustrialov, Polevoi, Danielson, Wittchevsky, Sering, Semenov, Iermolov, Sviatlovsky, Cherniavski, Kulczycki, Masaryk, nor Afassa, not to mention others. Financial history has received less attention than it should, and commerce has been passed practically unnoticed. Nevertheless, it may be said that Professor Mavor has written a work which is indispensable to English readers in many ways and which, in spite of the limitations mentioned above, will long remain the best general account of the economic history of Russia in the Western European languages, if not in any language.

R. J. KERNER.

*History of the Norwegian People.* By KNUT GJERSET, Ph.D., Professor of Norwegian Language, Literature, and History, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa. In two volumes. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1915. Pp. xv, 507; xi, 626.)

ON May 17, 1814, after four centuries of union with Denmark, Norway formally resumed her place among the independent monarchies of Europe. Two years ago the centennial anniversary of this event was celebrated not only in Norway but in the Norwegian settlements of the American Northwest. As a part of this celebration the leading historical scholars of Norway undertook to write a co-operative history of the kingdom. This interest in the Norwegian past also extended to our own country and in 1915 it bore fruit in Dr. Gjerset's *History of the Norwegian People*.

It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that Dr. Gjerset's work must be classed among the more important historical publications of the